UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Walter Clinton Batchelor,) C/A No. : 5:12-2585-DCN-KDW
Dlaintiff)
Plaintiff,)
v.	ORDER
Dr. Drago; Nurse Stokes; Nurse Spivey;	,)
Nurse Smith; Dr. Tomarchio; Warden)
Eagleton; SCDC Director Byars, Warden)
McCall, Dr. Pate, Dr. Moore,)
)
Defendants	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants Dr. Drago, Nurse Stokes, Nurse Spivey, Nurse Smith, Dr. Tomarchio, Warden Eagleton, SCDC Director Byars, Warden McCall, and Dr. Pate filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on June 12, 2013. ECF No. 214. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on June 13, 2013, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 215. Defendant Dr. Moore filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on June 28, 2013. ECF No. 223. The court entered a *Roseboro* order on July 1, 2013, advising Plaintiff of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 224. Plaintiff responded to the Defendants' summary judgment motions on June 18, 2013 and July 9, 2013. ECF Nos. 219, 226. In his responses, Plaintiff contended that he was not able to respond to Defendants' summary judgment motions, in part, because the Defendants had not fully responded to Plaintiff's outstanding discovery requests. *Id.* Prior to filing his responses to

Defendants' summary judgment motions, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery. ECF No. 217. Subsequent to the filing of his responses in opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motions, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Produce and a Motion to Compel. ECF Nos. 234, 235. The court denied Plaintiff's motion for an extension and Plaintiff's discovery motions on September 27, 2013, finding that Defendants had fully responded to Plaintiff's discovery requests. ECF No. 251.

Because the court has now ruled on Plaintiff's outstanding discovery motions, Plaintiff is advised that he has until January 14, 2014 to supplement his Responses in opposition to Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff is advised that if he fails to respond adequately to Defendants' motions, the court may grant their Motion, which may end Plaintiff's case. Any reply of Defendants will be due by January 28, 2014. Plaintiff is further advised that the court will not consider any further motions from him at this time.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

December 31, 2013 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Hayman D. Hest

¹ Plaintiff filed an additional Motion to Compel, ECF No. 256, and Motion for Extension of Time to Complete Discovery, ECF No. 257, which were denied by the court. *See* ECF Nos. 261, 263.